REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1, 5-7, and 12-15 are amended. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original and other claims in this and any other application.

Claims 1, 2, 4/1-3, and 5-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turk (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,992) ("Turk") in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0145657) ("Yamamoto"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a face identification device comprising "determination means for determining whether a face image detected by the detection means matches with the face image stored previously in the storage means by comparing both face images." According to claim 1, "when a face image is stored in the storage means subsequently, the abstraction means restores to the original human body images taken by the camera, the detection means detects face images from the original human body images, and the determination means determines whether a face image detected by the detection means matches with the face image stored subsequently in the storage means by comparing both face images and displays a determination result."

By contrast, Turk discloses a face recognition system for determining which members of a family are watching a television. As the Office Action correctly states, "Turk does not teach the abstraction process." (Office Action, Page 4) Thus, the Office Action relies on Turk in combination with Yamamoto to meet all the limitations of claim 1. However, even if Turk and Yamamoto were properly combinable, which Applicants maintain they are not for the reasons stated previously, the combination still does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1.

More specifically, Turk does not teach or suggest that "when a face image is stored in the storage means *subsequently*, ... the determination means determines whether a face image detected by the detection means matches with the face image stored *subsequently* in the storage means by comparing both face images and displays a determination result." To the contrary, Turk requires that "a reference set of face images is obtained" *previously* during "initialization

8

operations." (Turk, 4:25-30 and FIG. 2) Moreover, Turk cannot possibly teach or suggest that "the abstraction means restores to the original human body images taken by the camera" because, as noted above, and correctly stated by the Office Action, "Turk does not teach the abstraction process." (Office Action, Page 4) Yamamoto does not cure the failings of Turk. Indeed, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest applying an abstraction process based on whether a *subject's* face "matches with the face image stored subsequently" at all, but rather based on the identity of the *viewer*. (Yamamoto, Paragraph 8) For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2 and 4/1-3 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1 for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 and on their own merits. Therefore, the rejection of claim 2 and 4/1-3 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 5-7 and 12-15 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1 quoted above and are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 and on their own merits. Therefore, the rejection of claim 5-7 and 12-15 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 8-11 depend from claim 7 and are allowable along with claim 7 for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 7 and on their own merits. Therefore, the rejection of claims 8-11 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 3/1 and 3/2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turk in view of Yamamoto in further view of Lu (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,307) ("Lu"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As the Office Action correctly notes, Turk "fails to disclose a detected face image is not applied with the abstraction process and is applied with a marker." (Office Action, Paragraph 3) However, as described above with respect to claim 1, from which claims 3/1 and 3/2 depend, Turk also fails to teach or suggest other limitations of claim 1. Neither Yamamoto nor Lu cure the

failings of Turk. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3/1 and 3/2 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Thomas J. D'Amico
   Registration No.: 28,371
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorney for Applicant

10